

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment and arguments filed on 7/21/2008.
2. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 have been amended.
3. Claim 5 has been cancelled.
4. Claim 19 has been added.
5. Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected.

Response to the Arguments

6. The applicant's arguments filed on 7/21/2008 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the Remarks, the applicant has argued in substance:

- (1) The applicant argued features, i.e., a portable device capable of receiving and activating an executable blocking key for preventing a certain function of the portable device.

Response:

- (1) The argued features read upon Campen in view of Cho.

Campen discusses a wireless device such as a personal digital assistant (PDA) or cellular telephone. Thus Campen shows the limitation of "a portable device".

Campen discusses the wireless device being programmable and capable of receiving a transmission that includes control parameters to disable certain applications. Thus Campen shows the limitation of "receiving an executable blocking key for blocking a certain function of the portable device".

Campen discusses receiving and recovering control parameters in the portable device and integrating the parameters into the operation of the wireless device. Thus Campen shows the limitation of "activating the received executable blocking key in the device in order to prevent a certain function of the portable device".

Campen did not specifically disclose “temporarily blocking a certain function of the portable device”. Therefore Campen is modified by Cho to show such features were obvious in the art at the time of the invention.

As a result, the argued features were shown by Campen as modified by Cho.

(2) Regarding the applicant’s arguments within the dependencies, Campen as discussed above, disclosed those limitations or Campen as modified by the secondary references Cho and Kim show those limitations.

As a result, the argued features read upon the references as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 6, 8-9, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Campen (US Patent No. 7,110,753 B2).

As per claim 6, Campen discloses:

- ***A portable device***, (Campen, Column 2, Lines 29-40).

- ***a radio configured for receiving an executable blocking key for blocking a certain function of the portable device,*** (Campen, Column 3, Lines 51-60 and Column 4, Lines 10-18).
- ***a control unit configured for activating the received executable blocking key in the device in order to prevent the function of a certain segment of the portable device thereof,*** (Campen, Column 1, Lines 50-59, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-65).

As per claim 8, Campen further discloses:

- ***the radio is configured for receiving the executable blocking key and/or unblocking key transmitted along a wireless, short-range connection,*** (Campen, Column 4, Lines 19-36).

As per claim 9, Campen further discloses:

- ***the radio is configured for receiving the executable blocking key and/or unblocking key of a message-form transmitted through a message service center,*** (Campen, Column 4, Lines 19-36).

Claim 15 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 8.

Claim 16 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 9.

As per claim 18, Campen further discloses:

- ***the control unit is configured for processing the executable blocking and unblocking keys,*** (Campen, Column 4, Lines 10-18).

As per claim 19, Campen discloses:

- ***means for receiving via a wireless connection an executable blocking key for blocking certain function of the portable device,*** (Campen, Column 4, Lines 10-18).
- ***means for activating the received executable blocking key in the device in order to prevent the function of a certain segment of the portable device thereof,*** (Campen, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 28 and Column 4, Lines 45-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campen (US Patent No. 7,110,753 B2).

As per claim 7, Campen further discloses:

- ***the radio is configured for receiving an executable unblocking key for releasing the function blocked by the blocking key,*** (Campen, Column 2, Lines 7-9, Column 3, Lines 51-60 and Column 4, Lines 55-65), Campen teaches receiving executable control parameters at the portable device. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such parameters could be for unblocking as well as blocking a function.
- ***the control unit is configured for activating the received executable unblocking key in the device in order to release the function that was prevented by the executable blocking key,*** (Campen, Column 1, Lines 50-59 and Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-65).

Claims 1-3, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campen (US Patent No. 7,110,753 B2), in view of Cho et al (Cho) (US Patent No. 6,993,329 B2).

As per claim 1, Campen discloses:

- ***activating said received executable blocking key by a control unit in the portable device in order to prevent the certain function of the portable device,*** (Campen, Column 1, Lines 50-59, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-65).

As per claim 1, Campen discloses receiving an executable blocking key but does not specifically disclose:

- ***receiving in a portable device an executable blocking key for temporarily blocking a certain function of the portable device,*** However, Cho in an analogous art discloses the above limitation. (Cho, Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cho into the method of Campen to temporarily block a function in a portable device. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would only want to block functions within the portable device when use of said device is restricted. (Cho, Column 1, Lines 13-27).

As per claim 2, Cho further discloses:

- ***an executable unblocking key is received in the portable device that cancels the executable blocking key in order to release the function of the portable device that was blocked,*** (Cho, Fig. 7, Column 15, Lines 15-28, “After that, the transmit path on/off switching block 304 switches the terminal into normal communication mode by receiving communication suppression release control signal from the central processing unit 306 and turning on the transmit path of the wireless

communication terminal."), Cho teaches sending an unblocking signal to the device in order to release the blocked function.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cho into the method of Campen to release the function of the device that was previously blocked. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would want a way to automatically return the device to normal communication mode once restriction is no longer required. (Cho, Column 15, Lines 24-40).

Campen further discloses:

- ***the received executable unblocking key is activated in the device***, (Campen, Column 1, Lines 50-59, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-54), Campen teaches the use of executable code (a key) containing operating parameters being received and activated within a device.

As per claim 3, Campen further discloses:

- ***the executable blocking or unblocking key is received in the portable device through a wireless, short-range connection in message form or via a cable***, (Campen, Column 4, Lines 19-36, "In an embodiment of the invention, connection device 310 may be capable of receiving a wireless transmission that may include control parameters. The wireless transmission may be in the form of a text message such as a Short Message Service (SMS) message, an electronic mail, a wireless application protocol (WAP) download, or local wireless link for example Bluetooth, IEEE 802.11 or infrared.").

Claim 12 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 14, Campen further discloses:

- ***activating said executable unblocking key,*** (Campen, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-54).

Campen does not specifically disclose the following limitations. However, Cho in an analogous art discloses:

- ***the executable blocking key is used for temporarily blocking a certain undesirable function of the portable device, until there is received an executable unblocking key,*** (Cho, Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cho into the method of Campen to temporarily block a function in a portable device. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would only want to block functions within the portable device when use of said device is restricted. (Cho, Column 1, Lines 13-27).

- ***the blocked function is released to function in the way it functioned before the activation of the executable blocking key,*** (Cho, Fig. 7, Column 15, Lines 15-28).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Cho into the method of Campen to release the function of the device that was previously blocked. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would want a way to automatically return the device to normal communication mode once restriction is no longer required. (Cho, Column 15, Lines 24-40).

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campen (US Patent No. 7,110,753 B2), in view of Cho et al (Cho) (US Patent No. 6,993,329 B2) and in further view of Kim (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0107005 A1).

As per claim 4, neither Campen nor Cho specifically disclose:

- ***there is displayed a confirmation request by using the portable device,***
However, Kim in an analogous art discloses the above limitation. (Kim, Page 2, Paragraph [0033] – Page 3, Paragraph [0035], “The controller 111 displays the received message along with the mode conversion and notifies the mode conversion under the control of the alarm processor 118 in step 214.”...“In step 216, the controller 111 checks whether a confirmation signal has been received.”), Kim teaches a message is displayed in the device until confirmation is received from the user.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim into the method of Campen and Cho to display a confirmation request in the device. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would to notify the user that they have entered an area and which requires their device to be restricted. (Kim, Page 2, Paragraph [0032] and Page 3, Paragraph [0035]).

Campen further discloses:

- ***the received executable blocking or unblocking key is activated in the portable device as a response to feeding in the confirmation,*** (Campen, Fig. 2, Column 3, Lines 51 – Column 4, Line 9 and Column 4, Lines 45-54, “Additionally, the wireless device may detect whether the transmission includes an authentication identifier. If the proper authentication identifier is not present within the transmission, the control parameters may not be integrated.”), Campen teaches that the key is activated in the device once the received transmission has been authenticated. By authenticating the transmission before accepting the parameters, the device is confirming that the request was received.

Claim 13 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 4.

Claims 10-11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campen (US Patent No. 7,110,753 B2), in view of Kim (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0107005 A1).

As per claim 10, Campen does not specifically disclose:

- ***the control unit is configured for displaying a confirmation request and for feeding in a confirmation before the received executable blocking or unblocking key is activated in the device,*** However, Kim in an analogous art discloses the above limitation. (Kim, Page 2, Paragraph [0028]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim into the device of Campen to include a means for displaying information and entering in a confirmation. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would want a way to view any messages received and enter in a response to a confirmation request. (Kim, Page 2, Paragraph [0028] and [0033]).

As per claim 11, Campen further discloses:

- ***the control unit is configured for processing the executable blocking and unblocking keys,*** (Campen, Column 4, Lines 10-18).

Claim 17 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 10.

Conclusion

9. The prior art not relied upon but considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is made of record and listed on form PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TANGELA T. CHAMBERS whose telephone number is 571-270-3168. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, 9:00am-6:30pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro, can be reached at telephone number 571-272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tangela T. Chambers/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617
October 14, 2008

/NICK CORSARO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617